

Law of Priority be applied as long as it is practical but not if stability of names or usage is threatened. In fact, my principal motive in writing this letter is not that of a taxonomist but that of a biologist who uses names as shorthand descriptions of his objects of study.

Family level: In my opinion no serious difficulties will arise among ecologists and other users of names if the Law of Priority is applied and AMPHICTENIDAE is used as proposed by Dr Holthuis (see also Pettibone, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 24). I will use it in the key mentioned above.

Genus level: I urge that the generic name *Pectinaria* be preserved and *Cistena* suppressed. Bibliographies, abstracting journals, etc. utilise generic names as the principal entries for unlocking the existing literature, which for *Pectinaria spp.* is quite extensive in regard to ecology, physiology, and also applications (i.e. fisheries biology contrary to Dr Holthuis's remark, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 19). By suppressing *Pectinaria* but not taking into account the prevailing custom of not citing synonymies in non-taxonomic work, the old literature on *Pectinaria spp.* will, as a means to finding information, become closed to the users of zoological names after *Cistena* had taken hold. On the other hand, the name *Pectinaria*, even if suppressed, would continue to prevail in the non-taxonomic literature for several decades. Species are identified by field workers and physiologists from taxonomic, monographic keys. All the existing keys and handbooks for polychaetes use *Pectinaria*. The labour of preparing a key for an entire polychaete fauna and the poor support of taxonomy ensure that our major keys (about ten for the sedentary polychaetes, worldwide) will not be revised for some time. Thus *Cistena* would for a long time live only for the taxonomists. I therefore do not agree with Dr Holthuis that the 'acceptance of *Cistena* would [not] cause much inconvenience'. Quite to the contrary, it will in my opinion certainly create confusion.

Species level: All of us realise that the choices open to you present very difficult problems. I urge you to decide in such a way that changes of sub-generic names (*Lagis* versus *Pectinaria*, see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 24, 26) will not be a consequence of your decision. I ask this for the reason given above, that the names are a means to an end which is of concern to all biologists and not only to taxonomists.

CONUS FERGUSONI G.B. SOWERBY III, 1873 (GASTROPODA):
COMMENT ON PROPOSED VALIDATION. Z.N.(S.) 2239
(see vol. 35: 189–191)

By W.O. Cernohorsky (*Auckland Institute and Museum, Auckland,
New Zealand*)

I fully support the conservation of *Conus fergusonii*. This specific name is now firmly entrenched in malacological literature, which, however, is not evident from Mr Tucker's citation of nine uses during the preceding 50 years.

The combination *Conus fergusonii* Sowerby has also been used by the authors listed below.

On page 190 of the application, line 13 from the foot, the name '*Conus flavocinctus*' should be corrected to '*Conus fulvocinctus*'.

REFERENCES

- EMERSON, W.K. & PUFFER, E.L. 1957. Recent mollusks of the 1940 'E.W. Scripps' cruise to the Gulf of California. *Amer. Mus. Novit.* no. 1825, 57 pp.
- GRANT, U.S. & GALE, H.R. 1931. Catalogue of the marine Pliocene and Pleistocene Mollusca of California. *Mem. San Diego Soc. nat. Hist.* vol. 1: 1-1036.
- NYBAKKEN, J. 1971. *The Conidae of the Pillsbury [sic] expedition to the Gulf of Panama. Studies in tropical American mollusks.* Univ. Miami Press, Coral Gables: 93-110.
- OLIVER, A.P.H. 1975. *The Hamlyn guide to shells of the world.* Hamlyn Publ. Group Ltd., London, 320 pp.
- OLSSON, A.A. 1964. *Neogene mollusks from northwestern Ecuador.* Paleont. Res. Inst., Ithaca, 256 pp.